

*mass* for the same purpose. Lastly, the force can be applied to a large number of purposes, viz., pumping, the extinction of fires, ventilation, reduction of temperature and others, as well as to auxiliary propulsion.

The comparison is made with sailing ships, because on account of the great cost and inconvenience of fuel for steam-power at sea, sailing ships still successfully carry on the bulk of the world's commerce; and if their only drawback, viz. the unreliability and contrariety of the winds which impel them can be overcome, as is proposed to be done on this principle, by applying the indirect but cumulated force of those winds, it may, notwithstanding unreasoning prejudices which such an assertion may elicit, be found unnecessary to import fuel from the land, when nature has provided a never ending supply of the vastest force ever at hand on the highway of the ocean.

---

ART. LIII.—*The Classificatory System of Kinship.* By  
REV. LORIMER FISON.

[Read 9th December, 1872.]

About the year 1848, the Hon. Lewis H. Morgan, of Rochester, New York, found among the Iroquois Indians a most extraordinary system of relationship widely differing from that with which we are familiar. He then supposed it to be an invention of, and confined to that particular tribe. But in the year 1857, having occasion to re-examine the subject, there occurred to him the possibility that it might prevail among other Indian tribes, and if so, how important a use might be made of it for ethnological purposes. Extending therefore his inquiries during the following summer, he found precisely the same system among the Ojibwa Indians, of Lake Superior. Every word used by them as a term of kinship was radically different from the corresponding term in the Iroquois; and yet in every case the meaning was the same. Before 1860, having found the system throughout the five principal stock languages eastward of the Rocky Mountains, and having moreover discovered traces of it in the Sandwich Islands, and in Southern India, he was encouraged to prosecute his researches on a more extended scale. He therefore solicited

the co-operation of the various missionary societies, "which," he remarks, "was cordially promised, and the promise amply redeemed." The Smithsonian Institution also and the Department of State gave him their aid, and his printed circulars went forth fortified by letters of commendation to men of science from the former; and to the various consular agents of the United States, from the latter. Those who, perhaps naturally enough, turn a deaf ear to the most urgent entreaties of a private individual, are often willing to lend their aid at the bidding of a great literary association, or of men in high position, whence in a few years Mr. Morgan found that he had abundant materials to his hand. He himself was the most diligent worker of all; and by personal investigation discovered the Iroquois system among upwards of seventy North American Indian nations, speaking as many different dialects. Besides these, his extended inquiries through his foreign correspondents furnished him with the systems of many tribes in Europe, Asia (where the system was found to prevail among all the Tamil and Telugu tribes, numbering near thirty millions), Central Africa, and the Pacific Islands. The results of these researches were tabulated by him, and published last year by the Smithsonian Institution in a large quarto volume of some 600 pages; a copy of which was sent to me several months ago, but I grieve to say that, through some untoward mishap, it has not yet reached me.

About three years ago, I being then in Fiji, Professor Goldwin Smith sent me one of Mr. Morgan's circulars and blank schedules, with a request that I would write down therein the Fijian system, which the United States Consul for Fiji had neglected to furnish, although requested to do so by General Cass of the Department of State. In reading over Mr. Morgan's circular, I was astounded to find that the characteristics of the system were set forth by him in the very words which one would use in describing those of the Fijian. So startling, indeed, were the facts disclosed, that before I got to the end of the circular, I actually turned the page over again, to assure myself by looking at the preliminary remarks, that I was not reading an account of the Fijian system. "Here," said I, "is something worth inquiring into. Similarities of language and customs may lead us into endless mistakes and bewilderment; but the fact of an intricate system, such as this, being found among

tribes so widely scattered, is conclusive in its evidence beyond all question."

I lost no time in searching out the Fijian system, my schedule of which, together with that of the Tongans, or Friendly Islanders, also made out by me, reached America just in time to be inserted in Mr. Morgan's great work. Afterwards I ascertained the systems of thirteen Fijian tribes, of Rotuma and of Samoa,\* and since my return to the colonies I have made diligent inquiries among the Australian Aborigines, resulting in discoveries which are considered to be of the greatest importance. "I am more and more impressed," writes the leader in these inquiries to me, "by each communication I receive from you, with the vast importance of your present field of research. In Australia and Polynesia, you are several strata below barbarism into savagism, and are nearer to the primitive condition of man than any other investigator."

Having thus introduced my subject, and stated my connexion with it, I will now endeavour to lay before you the peculiarities of the systems of kinship hitherto ascertained. It must be observed that in no tribe, as far as I am aware, has the system which the terms of kinship reveal, been found in actual operation at the present day. Polygamy, which is a progressive not a retrogressive step, has done away with the old license; but the evidence of the former existence of that license is fossilized, as it were, in those terms; and herein lies their great value.

The Malay system, whereof the Hawaiian may be taken as the type, is the simplest yet discovered; nor is it possible to imagine one simpler, for it is but one remove from utterly unrestricted and indiscriminate intercourse. Its specific terms by which the various degrees of kinship are designated, give us the following characteristics:—

1. All my grandfather's brothers are my grandfathers. All his sisters are my grandmothers.
2. All my father's brothers are my fathers; and all his sisters are my mothers. They all call me their child.
3. All my mother's sisters are my mothers; and all her brothers are my fathers. All these call me their child.

---

\* The Rotuman system was furnished by the Rev. John Osborne, and the Samoan by the Rev. W. Brown. Both these gentlemen are Wesleyan Missionaries.

4. The children of my father's brothers are called my brothers and sisters. So also are the children of my father's sisters, as well as those of my mother's sisters, and those of my mother's brothers. In other words, I address as my brothers and sisters, not only my own brothers and sisters according to our system, but all my cousins also.

5. All the children of my brothers are called my children. They address me as "father." So also with the children of my sisters.

6. All the grandchildren of my brothers, and all the grandchildren of my sisters, I call my grandchildren. They call me grandfather.

7. There are double terms for the relationship of brother and sister—one for the elder, and another for the younger. Whence there is no term by which I can designate all my brothers or all my sisters, unless I be either the eldest or the youngest of the family.

This seventh peculiarity I have found more or less modified in every tribe with whose system I have been able to make myself acquainted. It prevails among all the North American Indians, the Tamil and Telugu peoples of South India, the Polynesian tribes, and the Aborigines of Australia.

These characteristics reveal to us a Communal Family founded on the cohabitation of brothers and sisters. This family begins with a number of brothers living in promiscuous intercourse with a number of women who are their sisters. As they live so their children live, and the family is thus an infinite series of the nearest blood relations, no divergence into the collateral line being possible. An examination into the characteristics now given, will at once show that they all (excepting the last, which, though not in any way at variance with the communal idea, does not appear to be the necessary outcome of it) can be satisfactorily accounted for on this supposition, and that they can be no otherwise explained.

For instance, I being male, all my brothers' children are called my children, and they call me "father." This can be accounted for no otherwise than on the supposition that I cohabit with all my brothers' wives.

Again, I call my sisters' children my children, and they address me as "father." The evident reason of this is, that I cohabit with my sisters; for, if I recognise the child of a

woman as my child, and it recognises me as its father, the irresistible inference is that I cohabit with its mother.

In the Communal Family a child addresses any and every male of the generation next above its own as "father," because all those males cohabiting with all the females of that generation, among whom its mother is one, any one of them may be its father; and though it can, of course, distinguish its own mother from among those females, yet it calls them all "mother," because they are all the wives of the men whom it calls "father."

The Communal Family then appears to consist of a number of men banded together for the purpose of securing to themselves against the aggression of males outside the family the exclusive possession of a number of women all of whom are theoretically their sisters. I say theoretically, because it is evident at a glance that not all these women are own sisters to the males, those whom we should call cousins being included among them. And supposing the human race to have begun with a single pair; supposing, moreover, the absence of a purer teaching from without, or (what would have the same effect) the persistent disregard, resulting in utter forgetfulness, of that purer teaching, this is precisely that which we should expect to be the earliest form of the family. A nation might be either one such family, or a number of such families banded together for mutual protection.

We now come to the *Barbaric Family*, of which we have found two forms, called, for the sake of convenience, the *Turanian* and the *Ganowanian*, the latter term being compounded of two North American Indian words, gano, an arrow, and waáno, a bow. This form of the family has been found by Mr. Morgan among all the North American Indians, the Tamil and Telugu tribes of South India, and among many other nations; but not having yet received his book from the Smithsonian, I cannot state the extent of his discoveries. I myself have found it among the Fijian, the Friendly Islanders, and more or less modified among several Australian tribes. This system is founded upon the Malayan, and is a most important advance upon it. Its chief characteristics are as follow:—

1. Grandparents, as in the Malayan.
2. All my father's brothers are my fathers. All my mother's sisters are my mothers. This also is Malayan. But

3. All my father's sisters are my aunts. All my mother's brothers are my uncles. This is the key to the whole system.

4. I being male, all my brothers' children are my children ; but all my sisters' children are my nephews and nieces.

5. I being female, all my sisters' children are my children ; but all my brothers' children are my nephews and nieces.

6. The grandchildren of all my brothers, and those of all my sisters, are my grandchildren.

7. The double terms of the fraternal relationship, as in the Malayan.

From these characteristics it will be perceived that the Turanian system allows a divergence into the collateral line in the second generation, but returns to the lineal in the third. The Barbaric Family is therefore an alternate series (if I may be allowed the term), continually diverging from the direct line in one generation, and returning to it in the next.

The explanation of this is beautifully simple ; the advance from the Malay system resulting from the breaking up of the inter-marriage between brothers and sisters, which is effected in the simplest manner by the tribal organisation, an institution whose object seems to be nothing more nor less than to effect this purpose.

Suppose a nation to have the Malay system. It consists of a number of Communal Families, or of one such family whose children always inter-marry within the family. Suppose this nation to accept the tribal organisation. The effect of this important step is to break up these inter-marriages of brothers and sisters, by the simple process of dividing the Communal Family into tribes, and removing all the male children, or all the female, into another tribe, which gives its own in exchange. In the former case, where the male children are thus removed, the child is of the mother's tribe, as among the North American Indians, the Kamilaroi-speaking Aborigines of New South Wales, and the tribes of of Mathuata, Fiji ; and the system is that which we call the Ganowanian. In the latter case, where the female children are thus removed, the child is of the father's tribe, as among the Tamils, the Fijians (with the single exception, as far as

I know, of Mathuata), the Tongans, and the Narrinyeri, a South Australian Tribe; and the system is that which we call the Turanian.

A nation, therefore, which has the Barbaric form of the family consists, or did at one time consist, of two or more tribes which exchange their sons or their daughters.

Thus, *A* and *B* being two tribes under the Ganowanian system, *A* gives its sons as husbands to the daughters of *B*, taking in exchange *B*'s sons as husbands for its own daughters. Under the Turanian system, *A* gives its daughters as wives to the sons of *B*; and in return, *B* gives its daughters to *A*'s sons. (Observe throughout this paper I use the words "husband," "wife," and "marriage," in an accommodated sense.) Hence it is evident that the males of *A* are brothers to the wives of the males of *B*, and that the males of *B* are brothers to the wives of the males of *A*. The only change in the Malay system effected by this step, is the prohibition of intercourse between brother and sister. The old license of polyandry and polygynia is still preserved, the family consisting of a number of men, all brothers in theory, who live in promiscuous intercourse with a number of women, all sisters in theory, that is, sisters to one another, but not sisters to the males, who are their husbands. All the children of a tribe are called brothers and sisters; and since either all the male children, or all the female, are removed from the tribe, a man's matrimonial choice is restricted to the daughters of his father's sisters, and to those of his mother's brothers; but as many of these women as there are, so many wives has he. Accepting this theory, we have a ready explanation of all the peculiarities of the system.

For instance, I being male, all my brother's children are my children, because my brother and I have our wives in common; but my sister's children are my nephews and nieces, because I am restricted from intercourse with her, and therefore they cannot be my children. So also, I being female, my sister's children are called my children, because my sister and I have our husbands in common; but my brother's children are my nephews and nieces, because I am removed from him into another tribe. Whence his children cannot be my children.

The return of the collateral line into the lineal, in the third generation, is equally easy of explanation. Let *A* and *B* represent two males of different tribes. Under the

Ganowanian system or the Turanian, the sister of *A* is *B*'s wife, and therefore *B*'s son is *A*'s nephew.

But *A* gives his daughter to the son of *B*, who is *A*'s nephew.

The child of *A*'s nephew therefore is the child of *A*'s daughter, and consequently *A*'s grandchild by the mother's side.

All the other characteristics of the system are satisfactorily accounted for by this theory.

The simplest form of the tribal organisation, is the division of the whole nation into two families, tribes, or classes, which exchange their sons or their daughters; and this is doubtless the earliest form which the tribal organisation assumed. Thus I am informed by Mr. D. Stewart, that the tribe of Mount Gambier, South Australia, is divided into two such classes, which are distinguished by the names Kumite and Krokee for males, Kumitegor and Krokeegor for females. Every man is either Kumite or Krokee, every woman is either Kumitegor or Krokeegor. Kumite and Kumitegor of the same generation are brother and sister, so also with Krokee and Krokeegor. Kumite must always marry Krokeegor, and Krokee Kumitegor.

Mr. Chas. G. N. Lockhart, Commissioner of Crown Lands, Wentworth, New South Wales, tells me in a most interesting letter, that the Darling River tribes have the following tradition: There was originally but one man. This man had two wives, whose names were Kilpara and Mookwara. Kilpara's children were all Kilparas, so also are all their descendants. Mookwara's children were all Mookwaras, so also are all their descendants. A man may not marry a woman of his own class. A Kilpara man must always marry a Mookwara woman, and a Mookwara man a Kilpara woman. Even in cases of forcible abduction, this rule is strictly observed.\*

The Rev. R. H. Codrington, of the Melanesian Mission, informs me that among the natives of Mota, an island of the Banks group, there are two divisions called "veve," which is the word for mother. "A man," says Mr. Codrington,

---

\* With the above-named gentlemen, and with several others who have supplied me with valuable information, I was brought into communication by means of a letter which was published in *The Australasian*; and I most gladly avail myself of this opportunity of publicly expressing my thanks to the courteous gentleman who edits that paper for the aid which he has afforded me, by admitting my letter into his columns.



“must always marry into the other veve.” Remembering that veve means mother, we see that “marrying into the other veve,” means “marrying a child of the other mother.” In other words, this is exactly the arrangement effected by the Kumite and Krokee, of the Mount Gambier natives, and by the Kilparas and Mookwaras, of the Darling River tribes.

Mr. Codrington says, “there are no tribes, properly so-called, in all the Melanesian Islands; nor are there any hereditary chiefs having political power, excepting in the small Polynesian Colonies.” The natives rise in rank by “payment of money and pigs,” a singular custom, which shows that the Melanesians have a sort of aptitude for the so-called political economy of the day. Mr. Codrington, when he said there are no tribes among the Melanesians, doubtless had in his mind the Polynesian tribe, with its recognised chiefs of various grades, and its sharply defined castes; but where we find the effect of the tribal organisation, we must suspect the existence, either present or past, of the cause; and it is abundantly evident that the division into the two veve is tribal.

This partition of the whole nation into two tribes or classes, is the simplest form of the organisation which has for its purpose the breaking up of the intermarriage between brothers and sisters. We find, however, that there has been a tendency to subdivisions of the two principal classes. Various causes may have combined to produce this tendency; but it seems to me that the tribal organisation, once introduced, must have brought with it a progressive impetus, which would continually impel towards further change, by generating an idea which slowly but surely grew into that of the *acquisition* and *personal possession* of *property*.

This idea must have been altogether foreign to the Communal Family, and that it was of painfully slow growth, is evident from the fact that even at the present day it is but imperfectly developed in nations such as the Fijians, who advanced from the Malay system, through the Turanian, into polygamy who can say how many ages ago? Nevertheless, slow as the growth of the idea undoubtedly was, it certainly had its effect in increasing the number of subdivisions in the tribe. For the first division must have necessitated a partition of the common property, of women, of hunting grounds among the nomad tribes, and of arable

land among the agricultural. In the Communal Family, all property must have belonged to the common stock. The first division, by limiting the number of owners, introduced a new idea, which tended ceaselessly to still further limitation, and finally under the guidance of the law of the stronger culminated in polygamy, the highest form of intersexual law yet discovered among savage nations. Not until this stage had been reached, could there be transmission by inheritance of either property or rank. Consequently, we may perhaps infer that the Melanesians, who have no hereditary chiefs, are nearer to the Malay system than the Polynesians, who have both castes and chiefs by descent.

In some cases, the smaller tribes or subdivisions are distinguished by the names of certain animals, as wolf, bear, elk, tortoise, and so forth, among the North American Indians; and kangaroo, opossum, blacksnake, emu, bandicoot, &c., among the Australian Aborigines. It is a singular fact that, as far as I have been able to ascertain, tribes thus distinguished by totems or animal names, have for their system of kinship the Ganowanian, as distinguished from the Turanian, *i.e.*, they remove the boys from the tribe, and not the girls; whence, the son is of the mother's tribe, not of the father's. He does not inherit the father's rank or property. These are given to the father's sister's son. Thus, an American Indian does not inherit even his father's scalps, his weapons of war, or his medal. He goes forth from his tribe into that whence his father came; and from a passage in Dr. Livingstone's expedition to the Zambesi, we may conclude with certainty that this custom, and consequently the cause of the custom, prevail among some at least of the Central African tribes.

My researches among the *Australian Aborigines* have revealed a curious and novel classification, resulting in a system of kinship which seems to be intermediate between the Malayan and the Ganowanian. We are, however, not yet quite clear as to the precise form which it will take.

During my stay in Sydney last year, I became acquainted with the Rev. W. Ridley, M.A., a Presbyterian clergyman, who was for some years a missionary to the blacks, and who has a knowledge of the language of the tribes among whom he laboured. From him I learned that the Kamilaroi speaking tribes are divided into four classes, by means of

certain names, one of which every blackfellow bears. These are:—

Class 1.	Ippai, male.	Ippātha, female.
2.	Murri „	Matha „
3.	Kubbi „	Kubbōtha „
4.	Kumbo „	Butha „

Ippai and Ippatha of the same generation are brother and sister; so also with the other pairs.

Upon this classification, certain laws of marriage and descent are founded.

1. Ippai marries Kubbotha. Their children are Murri and Matha.

2. Murri marries Butha. Their children are Ippai and Ippatha.

3. Kubbi marries Ippatha. Their children are Kumbo and Butha.

4. Kumbo marries Matha. Their children are Kubbi and Kubbotha.

Assuming as a postulate what subsequent inquiry verified as a fact, that all men of the same class-name in the same generation are brothers in theory, and that all women of the same class-name in the same generation are sisters in theory, I elaborated from these class-names and the laws founded upon them the whole kinship system of these natives, which I found to present the Ganowanian characteristics. My memoranda thereon have since been published by the Smithsonian; and I have recently had the intense gratification of receiving from the Rev. E. Fuller, of Fraser's Island, Queensland, one of my printed schedules filled up with the system of a Queensland tribe, which on the more important points, beautifully confirms my theory; though it presents one strange anomaly which is very puzzling.

It is evident at a glance that this classification must break up the Communal Family, inasmuch as it prohibits intermarriage between brothers and sisters; for you will observe that a man must always marry into a class other than his own; and if the system accept all the logical consequences of this law, it must be identical with the Ganowanian. I have, however, reason to suspect that among those natives, the seed of progress fell on stony ground, and did not bring forth fruit to perfection.

A gentleman named Lance, of Bungawalbyn, on the Upper

Clarence, who first called Mr. Ridley's attention to the class names, and kindly took the trouble to correspond with me on the subject,\* assured me that all the men of a class considered as their wives all the women of the class appropriated to them in marriage. Thus, for instance, that every Ippai would look upon every Kubbotha in the light of his wife; and that even if he met a strange Kubbotha, he would claim the privileges of a husband, which claim would be allowed, or at least not violently resented, by her tribe. This is just what we might expect to find in a nation wherein the Ganowanian usages had not been altogether done away with by the influence of polygamy.

He gave me, moreover, another piece of information, which happily led to a very important discovery. "Sometimes," he said, "the marriage law was crossed and complicated in a manner which he did not understand." He had met with a couple whose cohabitation seemed to be at variance with the rules already given: an Ippai having an Ippatha to wife; and on being questioned by him, the woman had said, "What for you stupid? This Ippai is not a Blacksnake like other Ippais, but an Emu. That explains it."

It immediately occurred to me that we had here a clue to a valuable discovery. I suspected the existence of subdivisions in the four classes already mentioned—subdivisions marked by totems, or animal names, as among the North American Indians. Fortunately, just about this time, a despatch arrived from Lord Kimberley to the Governor of New South Wales, enclosing a letter from Max Müller, asking that certain philological inquiries should be made among the Aborigines. My friend, Mr. Ridley, was deputed by the Government to make these inquiries, and at my suggestion kindly engaged to search for the subdivisions whose existence I suspected. His success was beyond my hopes. He found that the four classes were subdivided into six others, each of which bore a totem as its distinguishing mark.

The Ippais and the Kumbos, together with their respective sisters, are subdivided into the Emus, the Blacksnakes, and the Bandicoots. The Murris and the Kubbis, together with their respective sisters, are subdivided

---

\* I thus mention the names of my informants, because I am unwilling, even in appearance, to claim as my own discoveries the facts which have been made known to me by the kindness of others.

into the Iguanas, the Paddy-melons,\* and the Opossums. Every blackfellow has three names, two of which are classificatory. First, the name of his class, as Ippai, Murri, &c. Second, his totem or animal name. His third name does not appear to be classificatory. It is simply a distinguishing title singling him out from among those who bear the same class-name and totem.

These subdivisions affect the law of marriage, but not the law of descent.

They affect the law of marriage thus—Every Ippai (*e.g.*) may cohabit not only with Kubbotha, who is his wife according to the law of marriage, but also with an Ippatha who has a totem other than his own, though never with an Ippatha who bears his totem. Thus, Ippai the Emu may take to wife Ippatha the Blacksnake, but not Ippatha the Emu. We should expect the law of descent to be affected by this extended license; and if it were so affected, endless complications and confusions must necessarily arise; but in point of fact it is not affected at all, the confusion being avoided by a very simple arrangement. The children of such a connexion take always the class-names which are borne by the children of their mother by her proper husband according to the law of marriage. This being so, and since in every case the child takes its mother's totem, not that of its father, it is evident that the law of descent is not affected. Thus, the children of Ippai the Emu and Ippatha the Blacksnake are Kumbo the Blacksnake, and Butha the Blacksnake, as are the children of their mother by her proper husband Kubbi. Moreover, since the child takes its mother's totem, and since these totems are evidently tribal, it follows that the child is of the mother's tribe, not of the father's, and that the system of kinship tends towards the Ganowanian.

From this extended matrimonial privilege, we gather that the system of the tribes speaking the Kamilaroi language permits a man to marry his half-sister by the father's side, but not his half-sister by the mother's side, nor his full sister. In other words, he may cohabit with the daughter of his father by a woman other than his mother, for though she may have his class-name, yet she cannot have his totem, her totem being that of her mother; but he may not cohabit with the daughter of his mother, even though she were begotten by a man other than his father; for she

---

\* Paddy-melon is a sort of Kangaroo.

would have her mother's totem, which he also bears. Of this regulation we find traces in Old Testament History, and in the Laws of Solon.

The marriage of Abram with Sarai was of this class ; and even as late as David's time, we note its influence still prevailing, though it was distinctly forbidden by the Mosaic Law. Tamar's objection to Ammon's advances was not that there was any inseparable bar to their union in the nearness of their blood, but that the previous formalities necessary to honourable marriage had not been observed. "Now, therefore," said the poor girl, "I pray thee speak to the king, for he will not withhold me from thee."

Further inquiry is necessary in order to determine the exact place of this system ; but as far as I can see at present, it seems to be intermediate between the Malayan and the Ganowanian. The females and their children in the female line remain in the tribe, while the male children pass out of it into that whence their fathers came, as among the North American Indians. So far the tribe is complete. But an American Indian has unlimited range in the selection of a wife beyond his own tribe ; whereas there seem to be certain restrictions connected with the totems of the Kamilaroi speaking tribes, which narrow the range of selection. But inasmuch as my information on this point is incomplete, I prefer to await the result of further inquiry, before stating the theory I have formed as to these restrictions. Suffice it to say, that the Kamilaroi system appears to be an arrested development of the Ganowanian.\*

Extending our inquiries northward from Sydney, we find the class-names in tribe after tribe ; and though the names in use in certain tribes are words radically different from those of the Kamilaroi, and the totems also vary, nevertheless, the arrangement effected by them, as far as my information goes, is precisely the same ; but as we advance southward, we lose all trace of the class-names. My informants positively assure me that they are unknown to the South Australian tribes ; and this assertion is confirmed by the fact that in those tribes the child is of the father's tribe not of the mother's, as among the Kamilaroi.†

---

\* It is a singular fact, that two at least of the stock languages spoken by the tribes holding this system—the Kamilaroi and the Wiraithari—derive their title from the negative, which is in the former case Kamil, and in the latter Wirai.

† This requires qualification. The Mount Gambier Kumite and Krokee are classificatory, and make the child of the mother's tribe.

The terms of kinship used by one of those South Australian tribes, the Narrinyeri, have been partially furnished to me by the Rev. Geo. Taplin, of the Point Macleay Mission. The information which he gives me is so extremely valuable, as far as it goes, that I am filled with regret because it goes no farther. Narrinyeri is a word signifying "belonging to men," and is arrogated to themselves by that tribe as their exclusive right. They consider other nations to be unworthy of the title, and speak of them contemptuously, as merkani, or wild. Here we have amusingly reproduced the βαρβαροι of the Greeks, and the undertone of contempt which is heard in our own "foreigner." Human nature is the same all the world over, and every nation says in its heart, "We are the people." As far as I can judge from the terms of kinship supplied by Mr. Taplin, the Narrinyeri system is Turanian. It has the following specific terms: Maiyanowe or Mutthanowe, my grandparent; Nanghai, my father; Nainkowa, my mother; Wanowi, my uncle; Barno, my aunt; Gelanowe, my elder brother; Maranowe, my elder sister; Tarte, my younger brother or sister; Porlean, my child, Nanghare, my nephew or niece, a male speaking; Mbari, my nephew or niece, a female speaking; Maiyarare or Mutthari, my grandchild; together with a number of terms whose exact meaning I am unable at present to ascertain; but which are probably either resolvable into the terms already given, or traces of new regulations restricting the old license. It is possible, however, that we may find in them evidences of an arrested development of Turanian ideas.

One remarkable peculiarity of the system is that I call my son-in-law and my daughter-in-law "my grandchildren," and they call me "grandfather." This peculiarity I find in the Fraser's Island system also, which was furnished to me by the Rev. E. Fuller. Now among all the Australian Aboriginal tribes concerning which I have been able to gather information, there exists a singular taboo between a man and his mother-in-law. "When a blackfellow is brought into accidental contact with his mother-in-law," says one of my correspondents, "his mingled shame, fear, and wrath, are quite ludicrous to behold." "If a native is compelled to speak to his mother-in-law," writes another, "they will turn back to back, and shout as if they were far distant the one from the other."

If this taboo prevail between a woman and her father-in-

law, as well as between a man and his mother-in-law, we have a singular explanation of this peculiarity in the system. It is simply a separation of the tabooed kin by a wider interval, brought about by a theoretical insertion of an additional generation between them.

In the terms given by the Rev. G. Taplin, we see the necessity of the very greatest care and patience in examining an Australian system, as well as the all but utter impossibility of success, unless the inquirer is well versed in the native tongue; for the native words suffer such extraordinary changes in their inflexions and combinations, that it is very difficult to guard against endless mistakes and confusion in making our inquiries. Thus, I learn from Mr. Taplin, that my father is Nanghai, your father, Ngaiowe; his father, Yikowalle; my mother is Nainkowa, your mother is Nainkowi, his mother is Narkowalle. What man ignorant of the native tongue could suspect Yikowalle to be the same word with Nanghai, allowing for the difference in the possessive pronoun? or Narkowalle to have but a nominal difference from Nainkowa?\*

I cannot resist the temptation to make a short digression here. The advocates of the theory of man's gradual development by his own inherent and unaided energy, have drawn an argument from language, which seems to be not only altogether unsupported, but flatly contradicted by fact. Thus, Büchner in his furiously materialistic *Kraft und Stoff* asserts that the language of savages is little removed from the inarticulate sounds made by the lower animals, whereas the unvarying testimony of the facts collated by these researches of ours, is to the effect that the languages spoken by savages are far more elaborate as to their grammatical forms and inflexions than are those of civilised nations; complex forms being dropped one by one in the line of advance, as too cumbrous to be borne in a rapid march. A very few facts will be amply sufficient in support of this assertion: The Nariyeri nouns have two cases more than the Greek nouns have, and are inflected throughout all the cases. The Kamilaroi verbs have at least three forms of the

---

\* I have not found these complications in other Australian dialects, concerning which I have been able to gather information. Elsewhere the possessive pronoun is not incorporated with the term of kinship, but simply follows it. These dialects offer to the philologist a wide and important field, which must be explored now or never, for the native races are dying out with a fearful rapidity. The facts relating to their decrease given me by some of my correspondents are positively appalling.



Imperative, each form being an inflexion of the verb, one expressing command absolute, as "spear;" another command defiant, as "spear, if you dare;" and a third command with delay in execution, as "spear, by and bye." The Tongan has two sets of possessive pronouns, the active and the passive, each set being subdivided into two others, the definite and the indefinite. The Fijian has two sets of personal pronouns, at least in the first person, the inclusive and the exclusive; whereof the former includes the persons addressed, while the latter excludes them. This peculiarity is found in the North American Indian languages also. Moreover, while all, or almost all, the Polynesian dialects, and the Australian also, have three numbers, the Fijian has no fewer than four, singular, dual, trinal, and plural. It has three sets of possessive pronouns, one for ordinary possession; another for possession of eatables, which their possessor either is going to eat or has eaten; and yet another for the possession of drinkables, which their possessor is either going to drink or has drunk; while to words expressing parts of a whole, it postfixes its possessive pronouns in an abbreviated form. I may observe in passing, that under the blessed influence of civilisation, caused by contact with the superior race, resulting in acquaintance with its strong waters, these drinking pronouns are coming into much more frequent use than of yore.

Having set before you the principal systems hitherto discovered among savage nations, I propose now to examine as briefly as possible, certain terms of kinship in the language of one particular nation, with a view to summon, as it were, those terms as witnesses in the case, to cross-examine them, and to extract from them the information which the degrees wherein they are used, and, where it can be ascertained, their etymology, ought to disclose. For this purpose I take the Fijian system, because it is that with which I am best acquainted, and especially because, being thoroughly familiar with the Fijian tongue, I can draw from its terms of kinship the evidence which their etymology affords. This evidence is not a little curious, and it is, to me at least, extremely interesting.

Under a system which allows promiscuous intercourse of a number of males with a number of females, or where the influence of such a system is still lingering in spite of advanced regulations, we should naturally expect to find the terms by which the conjugal relationship is expressed to be

loose and vague, wanting in that precision which is found in our own terms, and most certainly giving forth no hint of a sacred obligation. This is exactly what we do find.

The Fijian term wati, which is common to both sexes, like our "spouse," is very far from expressing our idea of conjugal relationship. It means nothing more than "one with whom I may cohabit." A Fijian rarely uses it in speaking of his wife. He seems to be withheld from using it by a sense of shame, and usually speaks of her as Nonggu Alewa, my woman. Precisely similar is the Tongan term Unoho, and the Kamilaroi Gulia. The Hawaiian has Kana for husband, and Wahine for wife; but these terms mean no more than male and female. The Tongan Unoho tells a tale from which we instinctively shrink; but it is so strikingly illustrative of my subject, and so fearfully expressive of degradation, that I cannot pass it by, even though I must apologise for dragging it into light and exposing its shame.

Unoho is compounded of two words, Unu and Oho. Unu=insero. Oho=vehementer admoveo; and with a causative prefix, Unoho is used as a verb to express the act of taking the sow to the boar. Whence, we see that there is not the faintest hint of the sanctity of the marriage tie in this word. It is nothing more than a brutal expression of sexual intercourse.

Next we have the fact that the term Wati, or spouse, is used by a man to designate his brother's wives as well as his own. He thus addresses not only the wives of his own brothers according to our system, but those also of all the men who are his brothers according to the Turanian system, *i.e.*, the sons of his father's brothers, and those of his mother's sisters. A woman thus addresses the husbands of all the women who are her sisters, according to the Turanian system. In this fact we have conclusive evidence of the old license under that system, and we see this evidence surviving in the terms of kinship, though the practice which it records was long since prohibited by the advance into polygamy. The terms used when the practice was allowed have long survived the practice.

In one of the Fijian tribes, I found "my brother's wife" a male speaking, and "my sister's husband" a female speaking, rendered by Nonggu Ndaku, *my back*. This term, however, is used interchangeably with Watinggu, my spouse. In another tribe, speaking a dialect widely differing from that

spoken by the former, I found the term to be Eku Tambu, my forbidden one. These terms appear to me to be historic, and to point to the bringing in of a new law forbidding the old license. The significance of Eku Tambu, my forbidden one, is discernible at a glance, for surely such a word could never have been chosen as a specific term of kinship, unless that which is now forbidden were formerly allowed. Nor is Nonggu Ndaku less significant to one who is versed in the language. It cannot be one of the original terms of kinship, because every one of those terms takes the possessive pronoun postfixed in an abbreviated form, as Wati, spouse; Watinggu, my spouse; Tama, father; Tamanggu, my father; Luve, child; Luvenggu, my child, &c. I have already said that the possessive pronouns are thus combined with those words which express parts of a whole; and it is to be noted that these are the only words wherewith they are so combined. In the tribal idea we see the reason why the terms of kinship are words of this class. The savage does not look upon himself as an individual. The tribe is the individual—the body—the great whole, whereof he and all his kinsfolk are the component parts. Herein we have an explanation, if not a justification, of savage acts of revenge; and, extravagant as my words may sound, I do not hesitate to say that the fact of these possessive pronouns being postfixed to the terms of kinship, points unerringly to the cause of that lamentable tragedy which took from God's army on earth one of His best and bravest captains. I allude to the murder of Bishop Patterson. But this a digression.

Nonggu Ndaku does not mean my back in the sense of my own back; that would be Ndakunggu; it means "somebody whose back is turned towards me," or "towards whom my back is turned"; and it appears to me to be an evident trace of the bringing in of a new law. But though this law must have been in force among the Fijians ever since the introduction of polygamy among them—*i.e.*, from time immemorial—yet we see even at the present day, together with an outward conformity to the rule, a secret disregard of it; which shows, as it seems to me, that it was enforced upon them by an external authority, and that it has not even yet produced in their minds the idea of a moral obligation. Whence we see clearly that immense periods of time must have been required for the gradual development of the changes wrought by the tribal organization. In point of fact, even at the present day (at least among the

heathen and among those tribes also which have been but partially brought under the purifying influence of Christianity), a man's treating his brother's wife as his wife is looked upon with a lenient eye, and the offender's tribe becomes virtuously indignant only when the offence is known beyond the tribe. The guilt of the offence seems to lie in its being found out. I questioned on this subject a very amusing but intolerably garrulous old native of Rewa, willingly submitting for the sake of the information which I got from him to his endless reminiscences of the two great chiefs of his nation, Ndakuwanka and Mbativuaka (in English, "Back on Fire" and "Pig's Tooth" his brother), whose faithful henchman he was. "Tell me," I asked, "how was it before Christianity came to Rewa? What was done to a man who took his brother's wife?" Whereupon he informed me that the husband would not be angry, "Ena vakavinavinaka ga." He would say "It's all right," replied my old friend, in an indulgent tone and with a careless wave of his hand. But he would also say, "Bring hither our mother, that she may reprove this youth." I asked, "Which of their mothers, for they might be many?" and my informant answered, "The mother of him who had entered his brother's house"—this being the euphemistic phrase for the offence. He then went on to tell me that the mother would remonstrate with the offender somewhat as follows: "How is it my son, that you act thus foolishly? Have you then no house of your own, that you must enter your brother's? Cease, I pray you, these doings, lest our townfolk hear thereof and drive us away." "But why should they drive them away?" I cried. "They would do the same thing among themselves?" "True, sir, true," replied the old man, "but they would drive them away, because the thing is forbidden."

Here we have a curious and most significant trace of the old license existing even now, side by side with the authority which forbids it—the forbidden practice winked at by those most nearly concerned, and yet punished if publicly known by the very people who secretly allow themselves the same indulgence. Was there ever such a keeping up of appearances since the day when the Pharisees, who wanted to put to death the woman taken in adultery, had to sneak away one by one, none daring to cast the first stone?

The next significant fact to which I wish to call your attention is, the singular taboo prevailing between brother and sister among the Fijians, which is precisely that existing between a

man and his mother-in-law among the Australian Aborigines. The term used to express the fraternal relationship is "Ngane," a word whose primary meaning is to shun, or avoid; and in Fiji, brother and sister shun one another with all the anxious care shown by an Australian Aborigine to avoid his mother-in-law. As soon as a boy arrives at the hobbedehey stage he is removed from his father's house to the Mbure, or bachelors' hall, whereof there is one at least in every village, the avowed object of this removal being the separation of brother and sister. He may not eat with his sister; he may not touch her; it is considered positively indecent for him to address her; and he must not even speak of her by the proper term of kinship. If he be compelled to refer to her, he will not use the term Nganenggu, my sister, but Tathinggu, my brother, or Wekanggu, one of my kinsfolk. This sense of shame is not merely a hypocritical putting on of false modesty. That it is thoroughly real, I have fully convinced myself by repeated tests; and I was once not a little amused by the perplexity of one of our missionaries, who, being ignorant of the taboo, and having translated into Fijian the child's song, "I have a father in the Promised land, &c.," was beyond measure puzzled by the strange phenomenon which manifested itself when he was teaching Fijian children to sing it. They got on very well till they came to the verse "I have a brother in the promised land," at the giving out whereof the boys lifted up their voices and sang lustily; but the girls hung down their heads and were silent. At the next verse "I have a sister, &c.," it was the girls who sang, while the boys were voiceless; and no persuasion could induce boy or girl to sing the objectionable line. What is the meaning of all this? To me these facts seem to point to a time when intercourse between brother and sister, which had been commonly practised, was forbidden by some authority powerful enough to enforce the most stringent regulations to put down the practice; for surely for no other purpose could regulations so stringent be required. Moreover, I conclude that this authority must have been first exercised at some immeasurably remote epoch, ages before the first prohibition of intercourse with a brother's wife; inasmuch as it is not looked upon like the latter as a law whose evasion is excusable, but as a moral obligation, to break which would be the most shameful crime a man could possibly commit.

The word for my sister's husband, a male speaking, is in

the Fijian, *Tavalenggu*. The word for my brother's wife, a female speaking, is *Ndauvenggu*. I am unable to explain the etymology of *Ndauvenggu*, but that of *Tavalenggu* is significant enough. The word is made up of *Ta*, a negative particle; *vale*, house; and *nggu*, the possessive suffix. *Tavalenggu*, then, means "not of my house." Now, the Rev. R. H. Codrington, of the Melanesian mission, after informing me of the two *veve*, or divisions, of Mota, tells me that a man always speaks of those of the other *veve* as "*Tavala ima*," or "belonging to the other side of the house." One cannot but be forcibly struck with the similarity between the *Tavala* of Fiji, and the *Tavala ima* of Mota, especially since strong linguistic affinities are observable in other words. The word for "father" is the same in both languages, and they both have the postfixed possessive pronouns.

These terms naturally connect themselves in our minds with the enormous houses which travellers have met with among various tribes not only in bygone times but even at the present day. Such for instance as the massive edifices of the Village Indians of Mexico and Yucatan, which, as Mr. Morgan states in a paper read by him before the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, being large enough to accommodate from fifty to a hundred families, "have given rise to fables of palaces," but were most probably the dwellings of Communal families.

In the Mota term "*Tavala ima*"—the other side of the house—we have perhaps a trace of the first progressive movement caused by the tribal organization; and in the Fijian *Tavalenggu*—not of my house—we may trace the further development of the new idea. In the former we see the Communal family split up into two divisions occupying opposite sides of the common dwelling; and in the latter we have the separation made more complete, by the removal of one division to another house. Unless I am much mistaken, we shall find the immense houses which travellers have seen in New Guinea, and elsewhere in the South Pacific, to be of this character.

I being a male in a nation holding the Turanian system, the contemporaries of my father in the tribe to which I look for my wife are my mother's brothers, whose wives are my father's sisters. And since their female children come into my tribe as the wives of my brothers and myself, one would expect that I should address these females by the term *Watinggu*, my wife. The fact is, that I address any one

of them as Ndavolanggu, a term which I translated in my rendering of the Fijian system by our word "cousin." As I gained a fuller knowledge of the system, I grew more and more dissatisfied with this translation, and long since became fully convinced that the system does not recognise the relationship of cousin at all, but that Ndavolanggu is no more than a synonym for Watinggu, my spouse. By this term Ndavolanggu, a man addresses the daughters of his father's sisters and those of his mother's brothers. Thus also a woman addresses the sons of her father's sisters and those of her mother's brothers. These males and these females are said to be Veindavolani to each other, and it is only within the Veindavolani that marriage is allowed. Let us examine these terms and see what evidence we can extract from their etymology. *Ndavo* means *to lie down*; *La* is a terminal particle of no particular meaning, whereof there are many in the language; *Vei* is a prefix which gives a reciprocal force to the word with which it is combined. Thus, *Vathu* is *to strike with the fist*; *Veivathu* is *to box*; *Ravu* is *to slay*; *Veiraravui* is *mutual slaughter*; *Tamana* is *to be a father to*; *Veitamani* expresses the relationship between father and child. *Nganena* is *to shun*; *Veinganeni* means *those who shun one another*, and is the word used to express the relationship between brother and sister. So also, *Ndavo* being *to lie down*, *Veindavolani* means *those who lie down together*. The term Ndavolanggu then simply indicates the person with whom the speaker has the right of cohabitation.

The important question now arises, how may we account for the prevalence of these systems of kinship among tribes so widely scattered? They could not have borrowed one from another, because of the distance which has separated them from time immemorial. We cannot entertain for a moment the theory of invention, or spontaneous growth of the same system, in every nation in whose language we find its terms. For, since the Turanian system has in it more than twenty independent characteristics, it is in the highest degree improbable that any two unconnected tribes should have invented, or gradually developed, the same system; and this improbability increases with every successive tribe among whom we have discovered the system, until it arrives at an utter impossibility long before we come to the end of our list. Moreover, not only have the main characteristics of the system been found among many widely scattered tribes; what is still more remarkable, the anomalous terms

of one tribe are reproduced in another, which is separated from it by half the circumference of the globe.

Take for instance the following peculiarity of that South Australian tribe, the Narrinyeri. Grandparent and grandchild address one another by the usual terms; but great grandfather and great grandchild call one another "*brother*." The great grandfather calls his great grandson "*my younger brother*," and the great grandchild calls his great grandfather "*my elder brother*." So also the great grandmother is called the elder sister of her great grandchild. If we were to find this strange peculiarity in, say, an Asiatic tribe, we should at once suspect that tribe to have been connected with the Narrinyeri at some time or other. We could not suppose that each tribe had invented the anomaly independently of the other. Now, I have not discovered this peculiarity in any other tribe than the Narrinyeri, and I state it here because I wish to call attention to it, in the hope of thereby leading to further discovery; but we *have* found peculiarities to the full as strange as this among nations equally remote. Thus in the Tamil system, I call my father's elder brother, Periya takáppan, my great father; but my father's younger brother, I call Seriya takáppan, my little father. The Fijian system repeats this peculiarity to the letter, calling my father's elder brother "*Tamanggu levu*," my great father; and my father's younger brother, "*Tamanggu lailai*," my little father.\* Again; in the Tongan system, I call the son of my father's brother "*my elder brother*," or "*my younger brother*," irrespectively of our ages, but accordingly as his father is younger or older than mine: that is, I call the son of my father's elder brother "*my elder brother*," even though he be my junior; I call the son of my father's younger brother "*my younger brother*," even though he be my senior. And this very peculiarity I have found reproduced in the Narrinyeri system.†

Taking, then, into consideration that we find the numerous independent characteristics of the system among the multitudinous tribes which have already been reached by our

---

\* So also does the Japanese. Moreover, the Rev. Mr. Homan, pastor of the Lutheran Church, Adelaide, informs me that these terms are reproduced in the system of the Diri, a Cooper's Creek tribe.

† A. W. Howitt, Esq., of Bairnsdale, Gipps Land, to whom I am indebted for an extremely valuable communication, informs me that this peculiarity is found among the tribes in his neighbourhood.



researches, and more especially since we find the peculiarities of one tribe reproduced with startling fidelity in another tribe far distant from it, we are, as it seems to me, irresistibly impelled to the conclusion that there must have been a time when all these widely separated nations belonged to one race and were inhabitants of the same land, and every fresh discovery made by our researches proclaims ever more clearly that "God hath made of one blood all nations of men to dwell on all the face of the earth."

Our discoveries are pointing more and more emphatically in the direction wherein many other lines of evidence have long been converging, viz., to *Asia*, as the fatherland and starting place of all these tribes.

As far as I am aware, no Asiatic nation has been found having the terms of kinship which reveal the Malay system. It is quite possible that this system may yet be discovered among the mountain tribes; but hitherto the least advanced in civilization of all the Asiatic families, are found to have reached the Turanian system. But the Malay system appears in very many Polynesian tribes; whence we may infer that, supposing *Asia* to be the starting place, the great Malayan emigration took place before the introduction of the tribal organization into *Asia*, resulting in the advance to the Turanian system. We need not be surprised at the Malayan system being found among Polynesian races, although it has altogether disappeared from the land whence they came; for insular life is always more stationary than is continental, because it is less exposed to external impulse—of course I speak of insular life as it is found among the Pacific Islands. Moreover, since we find Turanian characteristics among the Fijians and the Tongans, and taking for granted that the first emigrants from *Asia* brought the Malay system with them, we must infer either that, at the time of their emigration, both the Malayan system and the Turanian prevailed in *Asia*, and that some of the emigrants had one system and some the other; or, that there must have been two successive waves of emigration separated by an interval wide enough to allow of the development of the Turanian system in *Asia* before the second wave left its shores. The latter theory seems to me the more probable of the two, and I have found curious confirmation of it in the glimpses I have been able to get of the kinship system prevailing among the heathen mountaineers of Navitilevu, the largest island in the Fiji group. Long before my attention was

called to these researches, various facts, especially linguistic peculiarities, led me to think it probable that the mountaineers were the aborigines of that island, and that they had been driven into the hills by the present occupiers of the coastline. If this theory be correct, and if there were two successive emigrations from Asia, the hillfolk probably came with the first, and the coast tribes with the second. We should then expect to find traces of the Malay system among the mountaineers, and of the Turanian among the coast tribes. And this is precisely what I have found.

When we consider the immense area over which we have discovered the system within the past twenty years, together with the traces which we gather of it from ancient writers, such as Herodotus, bk. i. cap. 216; and especially Caesar, who, in his Commentaries, book v., cap. 14, speaks of our own ancestors as having *uxores inter se communes*; and when we take into consideration also how painfully slow of growth and development are progressive ideas, especially when those ideas tend to purification by limiting self-indulgence, we cannot but feel that these researches carry us back far beyond the historic times into the very remotest antiquity. They are far-reaching and intelligent guides across that which without them is a trackless waste. By their aid we have struck and followed a broad and well-defined trail, where formerly we could discover but an uncertain footmark here and there. In them we have a voice speaking clearly and distinctly to us from that which has hitherto been a land of silence, and they shed a strong light on what was heretofore a region of darkness, showing us the forms of that shadowy host who bring up the rear in the onward march, whereof we now are leading the van. Thus at least it appears to me.